

V. Remarks

Claims 16-19 are rejected and pending; claims 16, 17, and 19 have been amended; and claims 21-24 have been added. With the claims amended and the remarks provided below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a withdrawal of all rejections.

Amendments to the Specification

Amended paragraph [0006] now properly defines the acronym "NVH" as referring to "noise, vibration, and harshness." Paragraph [0005] of the original application as filed defined the acronym "NVH" as noise, vibration and harshness. Therefore, no new matter is added.

Objections to the Abstract

Responsive to the objection of the Abstract, the phrase "the present invention involves" has been deleted from the Abstract.

Amendments to the Drawings

Fig. 1 has been amended to include reference numerals 34, 37, 41, 44, 47, and 51. Additionally, the line A-A has been added to Fig. 1. Paragraph [0015] in the original application as filed refers to the "body portion 34," the "tube-engaging pilot 37," the "head 41," the "outer wall 44," the "contact wall 47," and the "shoulder 51." Additionally, paragraph [0014] of the original application as filed refers to the "central axis A." Therefore, no new matter is added.

Fig. 3 has been amended to include the reference numeral 25. Paragraph [0014] in the original application as filed refers to the "second open end 25." Therefore, no new matter is added.

Claim Objections

Responsive to the objection of claim 19, claim 19 has been amended to delete the reference "in-oz."

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Responsive to the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Oros, et al.*, *Oros, et al.* fail to teach each and every element of a device as claimed in the present application. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either explicitly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended claim 16 includes "a Nd:YAG laser-welded material located proximal to the outer shoulder and to the open end of the tube." *Oros, et al.* are absent any teaching of a Nd:YAG laser-welded material. Rather, *Oros, et al.* teach an arch-welded material instead of a Nd:YAG laser-welded material. (*Oros, et al.*, col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 15).

Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16. Therefore, claims 17 and 18 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Zackrisson*, *Zackrisson* fails to teach each and every element of a device as claimed in the present application. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either explicitly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended claim 16 includes "a Nd:YAG laser-welded material located proximal to the outer shoulder and to the open end of the tube." *Zackrisson* is absent any teaching of a Nd:YAG laser-welded material.

Rather, *Zackrisson* teaches a heliarch-welded material instead of a Nd:YAG laser-welded material. (*Zackrisson*, col. 2, lines 21 through 23).

Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16. Therefore, claims 17 and 18 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Breese*, *Breese* fails to teach each and every element of a device as claimed in the present application. *Breese* is absent any teaching of a Nd:YAG laser-welded material. Rather, *Breese* teaches the general step of using a weld to join the driveshaft tube 16 and the end fitting 22, instead of using a Nd:YAG laser-welded material. (*Breese*, col. 2, lines 57 through 59).

Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16. Therefore, claims 17 and 18 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Responsive to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oros, et al.*, *Oros, et al.* do not teach or suggest all of the elements of this claim. Claim 19 depends on claim 16. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable for the reasons provided above.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zackrisson*, *Zackrisson* does not teach or suggest all of the elements of this claim. Claim 19 depends on claim 16. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable for the reasons provided above.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breese*, *Breese* does not teach or suggest all of the elements of

this claim. Claim 19 depends on claim 16. Therefore, claim 19 is allowable for the reasons provided above.

Further Claim Clarifications

Independent claim 21 has been added. Claim 21 recites a laser-welded driveshaft including a laser-welded material located proximal to the outer shoulder and to the open end of the tube. Paragraph [0017] in the original application as filed discloses laser-welded materials located between the yoke and the open end. Therefore, no new matter is added.

Claim 21 is allowable. None of the above-cited references, *Oros, et al.*, *Zackrisson*, and *Breese*, discloses a laser-welded material located proximal to the outer shoulder and to the open end of the tube. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 22-24, which depend on claim 21 have also been added. Claims 17, 18, and 19 in the original application as filed disclose the subject matter of claims 22, 23, and 24 respectively. Therefore, no new matter is added.


Claims 22-24 depend on claim 21. Therefore, claims 22-24 are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

Thus, claims 16-19 and 21-24 should be allowed and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

1-20-04
Date



Lawrence G. Almeda (Reg. No. 46,151)
Attorney for Applicants

Attachments: Replacement Sheet 1
Annotated copy of Sheet 1

-10-



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599